

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 21-23, 25, 27-32, and 34 are pending in this application. Claims 1-20, 24, 26, 33 and 35 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 21-22, 25, 27-28, 30-31 and 34 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

Of the claims that remain pending, claims 25, 27, 29 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Shapiro, U.S. Patent No. 5,991,810. Further, claims 21-23, 28, and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro, U.S. Patent No. 5,991,810 and Krishnamurthy et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,578,113. Reconsideration of the rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The independent claims are directed to the second information processing device of the invention which is for providing a copy of original information to a user and which communicates with the first information processing device and connects, by way of an access control device, to a local area network and the Internet.

According to amended claim 21, the memory section stores in advance a second copy of original information held in the first information processing device, and a communications unit acquires a first rewrite information relating to a first copy of original information from another second information processing device connecting to the Internet and having the first copy of original information corresponding to the second copy of original information possessed by the memory section. The control unit makes a second rewrite information

relating to the second copy of original information possessed by the memory section, and compares the second rewrite information with the acquired first rewrite information.

In claim 27, the access control device controls the connection between the local area network and the Internet; and the memory section of the second information processing device stores in advance a copy of original information held in the first information processing device. When a copy of original information from the first information processing device is not held in a memory section, the original information is acquired by the communications unit from the first information processing device. A control section calculates rewrite information of the acquired information and the communications unit sends the calculated rewrite information to another second information processing device.

According to claim 30, the plurality of the second information processing devices have a memory section for storing in advance a second copy of original information held in the first information processing device. A communications unit acquires a first rewrite information relating to a first copy of original information from another second information processing device. Further, the control unit makes second rewrite information relating to the second copy of original information possessed by the memory section, and compares the second rewrite information with the acquired first rewrite information.

The claimed invention provides a system capable of monitoring devices providing services over the Internet for unauthorized tampering, as explained in the specification (see, page 3, lines 19-22 of the specification). In the present invention, a plurality of replicas (second information processing devices) of the service provider system (first information processing devices) inside of the firewall (access control device), are installed outside of the

firewall, and the user receives service provided only from these replicas. Each replica periodically compares information contents (copies of original contents) with the information held by the other replicas to check if unauthorized tampering has occurred (see, page 4, lines 8-18 of the specification).

On the other hand, in Shapiro, a system and method is disclosed for limiting access to web site information stored on a proxy cache sever within a local area network or intranet (see, column 1, lines 60-62). The parameters of the access control list are preprogrammed by a system administrator based upon the institution's Internet access control policies. The proxy cache server permits access or denies access based upon the particular access limits associated with the requesting client and the parameters of the requested site (see, column 2, lines 21-26 of the reference). That is, Shapiro is concerned with a conventional proxy server that connects with a WWW Server in place of the user computer, to transmit data acquired from WWW Server to the user, and preserve it temporarily.

On the other hand, the replica of the present invention (second information processing device) where the copy of information on a WWW Server is maintained beforehand provides service (information) upon demand of the user so that as a result, the WWW Server is protected from unauthorized tampering. That is, should someone tamper with the copy of the original information, thinking that the information being tampered with is the original information of the WWW server, the tampering can be determined by making a comparison of the information (a copy of the original information on the WWW Server) with the replica(s). Shapiro does not disclose this aspect of the claimed combination.

Krishnamurthy is relied upon for disclosing a conventional proxy server. The

Response to Final Office Action mailed February 7, 2006

Krishnamurthy reference does not overcome the deficiencies in the Shapiro reference as noted above with respect to comparing second rewrite information with acquired first rewrite information (claims 21 and 30), for example. Additionally, the dependent claims further define the novel aspects of the invention that are not disclosed or suggested by Shapiro, Krishnamurthy or the remainder of the art of record. Accordingly, the combination of Shapiro and Krishnamurthy does not render the invention unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

By 

John R. Mattingly
Reg. No. 30,293
(703) 684-1120

JRM/so

Date: July 7, 2006